Minimal cover of high-dimensional chaotic attractors by embedded coherent structures

Daniel L. Crane, Ruslan L. Davidchack, and Alexander N. Gorban
Department of Mathematics, University of Leicester, Leicester LE1 7RH, UK
(Dated: July 11, 2016)

We propose a general method for constructing a minimal cover of high-dimensional chaotic attractors by embedded coherent structures, such as periodic orbits. By minimal cover we mean a finite subset of periodic orbits such that any point on the attractor is within a predefined proximity threshold to a periodic orbit within the subset. The proximity measure can be chosen with considerable freedom and adapted to the properties of a given attractor. On the example of a Kuramoto-Sivashinsky chaotic attractor, we demonstrate that the minimal cover can be faithfully constructed even when the proximity measure is defined within a subspace of dimension much smaller than the dimension of space containing the attractor. We discuss how the minimal cover can be used to provide reduced characterisation of the attractor structure and dynamics on it.

PACS numbers: 05.45.-a, 05.45.Jn, 47.27.ed

arXiv:1607.02180v1 [nlin.CD] 7 Jul 2016

Unstable periodic orbits form the skeleton of chaotic attractors, with shorter orbits giving the overall structure, and longer orbits refining this skeleton in smaller neighbourhoods. This property was first brought to light when Poincaré conjectured that any motion of a dynamical system can be approximated by means of those of periodic type [1]. This conjecture opened up a previously inaccessible avenue for breaching the frontier of chaotic dynamics using a periodic orbit-centric approach. In low-dimensional systems, this approach has seen considerable success, culminating in the development of the periodic orbit theory (aka cycle expansions [2]). The approach can also work well for low-dimensional attractors of high-dimensional systems [3, 4]; however when the dimensionality of the attractor is large (several positive Lyapunov exponents), even a qualitative description of the structure of the attractor becomes challenging.

In recent years a considerable amount of progress has been made in locating periodic orbits and other coherent structures in high dimensional chaotic systems. Examples include the work of López *et al.*[5], who presented a method for finding relative periodic solutions for differential equations with continuous symmetries, and used this method to find relative periodic solutions of the Complex Ginzburg-Landau equation. Hof *et al.*[6] found experimental evidence of the existence of travelling waves in turbulent pipe flow, in agreement with the numerical studies of Faisst et al.[7] & Wedin et al.[8]. Zoldi and Greenside[9] used a damped-Newton method to find unstable periodic orbits in the Kuramoto-Sivashinsky (KS) equation. More recently, Cvitanović et al.[10] used multiple shooting and the Levenberg-Marquardt algorithm to locate over 60 000 coherent structures in the KS equation on a periodic domain. Due to the presence of discrete and continuous symmetries, these structures include not only the traditional equilibria and periodic orbits, but also travelling waves and relative periodic orbits[5, 10] (also called 'modulated travelling waves' in [11]).

Now that large numbers of such coherent structures can be located in high-dimensional chaotic systems, the question is: how can we use this information to describe the structure of the attractor and dynamics on it? It is clear that there is a lot of redundancy in the data: coherent structures which are 'close' to one another essentially give the same information about the structure and dynamics of the attractor in their neighbourhood.

In this work we adopt the following pragmatic approach: From the set of all available coherent structures, we select a subset which maximally covers the chaotic attractor with minimal redundancy. We call such a subset a *minimal cover* of the attractor. The elements of this subset can then be used to describe the overall structure of the attractor. In order to perform the selection, we need to define the notion of 'closeness' (or proximity) of coherent structures to one another and to points on the attractor. Generally, the specific choice of metric is not important, since the metric of the embedding space changes under topologically conjugate transformations. The key feature that distinguishes 'close' points from 'distant' points in phase space is that orbits originating from 'close' points will remain close for some time (albeit exponentially diverging in the unstable manifold). This is true even if we view the dynamics in projection on a low-dimensional subspace. Therefore, it is preferable to measure distance not between individual points in space, but between segments of orbits. In this context, as we demonstrate below, the notion of the Hausdorff distance [12] between sets (in this case between segments of trajectories) is useful.

Minimal Cover Algorithm. The method by which the minimal cover is constructed has two stages. The first stage involves selecting from the set of all available coherent structures taken in the order of increasing complexity (e.g. period) those which cover different regions of the chaotic attractor. The second stage involves 'pruning' the selected coherent structures in order to remove those that cover the same regions, and hence 'minimise' the cover.

First Stage. The selection process proceeds as follows: Let $\mathrm{P} = \{p_i\}_{i=1}^{N_P}$ be a set of coherent structures listed in the order of increasing complexity (e.g., equilibria followed by periodic orbits of increasing period). Starting with the empty set as the initial basis of the cover $\mathrm{W} = \varnothing$, iteratively proceed through the structures in order of complexity, adding into the cover those structures whose *distance* to W is above some threshold, ε.

For $i = 1, 2, \ldots, N_P$:

$$\mathrm{W} \leftarrow \begin{cases} \mathrm{W} \cup \{p_i\} & \text{if } d(p_i, \mathrm{W}) > \varepsilon \\ \mathrm{W} & \text{if } d(p_i, \mathrm{W}) \leq \varepsilon \end{cases} \tag{1}$$

where $d(p_i, \mathrm{W})$ denotes the *distance* between p_i and W, which will be defined later.

Intuitively speaking, we only include a new coherent structure into the set W if it explores a part of the attractor that is not yet covered by the current W.

Second Stage. Due to the ordered nature of the above procedure (in that we construct it by going through structures in order of complexity), there may be some redundancy in that there may be structures of lower complexity in W that are fully covered by structures of higher complexity. In other words, it is possible that there exists $w_k \in \mathrm{W}$, such that $d(w_k, \mathrm{W} \setminus w_k) \leq \varepsilon$, where $\mathrm{W} \backslash w_k$ is the set W with the subset w_k removed. Such w_k can be removed without affecting the covering of the attractor. We can search for and remove all such redundant orbits as follows:

For $j = 1, 2, \ldots, N_W$:

$$\mathrm{W} \leftarrow \begin{cases} \mathrm{W} & \text{if } d(w_j, \mathrm{W} \setminus w_j) > \varepsilon \\ \mathrm{W} \setminus w_j & \text{if } d(w_j, \mathrm{W} \setminus w_j) \leq \varepsilon \end{cases} \tag{2}$$

where N_W is the number of coherent structures included in W after (1). We call the resulting W a *minimal cover*, since each coherent structure in the set uniquely covers some part of the attractor.

Directed Hausdorff Distance. During this process we are primarily concerned with calculating the distance from a coherent structure to the cover W. For this, the notion of the directed Hausdorff distance[13] between sets is useful.

$$d(p_i, \mathrm{W}) = \max_{t \in [0, T^{p_i}]} \min_{\substack{w_j \in \mathrm{W} \\ \tau \in [0, T^{w_j}]}} \|p_i(t) - w_j(\tau)\| \tag{3}$$

where T^{p_i} and T^{w_j} are the periods of coherent structures p_i and w_j respectively; p_i is a given coherent structure in set P, w_j is a coherent structure in the cover W; and $\|\cdot\|$ is the chosen norm in the dynamical system phase space with a given metric.

The directed Hausdorff distance $d(p_i, \mathrm{W})$ takes the point on the coherent structure p_i that is farthest from the set W, and gives the distance between this point and the closest point in W [14]. As such, upon the completion of the above process of constructing W, all coherent structures contained in P will be within ε distance of W.

Distance in Lower Dimensional Projections. In order to distinguish close and distant orbit segments using the directed Hausdorff distance it is not necessary to work in the full phase space, which could be very high dimensional (as in the case of the discretised Navier-Stokes flow). A reliable distinction can be made in a low-dimensional projection of the space. For example, one could take the first n principal components of the attractor, and/or work in a symmetry-reduced space.

For continuous-time systems and $k \geq 2$, k-dimensional projections of non-steady orbits are curves, and therefore they are infinite-dimensional objects. Generically, they do not coincide for two different orbits (for coincidence, a special "non-generic choice of projection is needed, e.g. with respect to some symmetries). For discrete-time systems, we have to consider sufficiently long orbits to guarantee this property. If projections of two orbits never coincide then the Hausdorff distance between projections is, at the same time, a distance in the space of orbits. This equivalence of spaces of orbits and their projections is the essence of the famous Takens embedding theorem [15]. The values of distances differ in different projections, therefore, depending on which projection is used, both the number of structures needed to cover the attractor, and the specific structures chosen (for a given ε) will differ relative to the full-dimensional counterpart. However, as we will demonstrate in the rest of this Letter, a reliable reduced representation of the chaotic attractor by a minimal cover can be achieved with a relatively small number of dimensions.

The Kuramoto-Sivashinsky Equation. To demonstrate the proposed method, we will use the set of coherent structures found by Cvitanović, Davidchack, and Siminos[10] for the Kuramoto-Sivashinsky (KS) equation

$$u_t = -u_{xxxx} - u_{xx} - \frac{1}{2}(u^2)_x, \; x \in \left[-\frac{L}{2}, \frac{L}{2}\right], \tag{4}$$

with periodic boundary conditions $u(x + L, t) = u(x, t)$ and system size $L = 22$ – a system with numerically stable chaotic dynamics. Since this equation is equivariant under translations and reflections [10], all solutions related by these symmetry transformations are equivalent. These symmetries also extend the set of possible coherent structures to include, in addition to the usual equilibria and periodic orbits, travelling waves and *relative periodic orbits* [10].

Due to the periodic boundary conditions, it is convenient to work with the Fourier representation of the solutions of (4):

$$u(x, t) = \sum_{k=-\infty}^{+\infty} a_k(t) e^{\frac{2\pi k x}{L}} \tag{5}$$

where $a_k \in \mathbb{C}$ and $a_{-k} = a_k^*$. As shown in [10], a sufficiently accurate solution of (4) can be obtained by the

spectral method using a truncated Fourier series with $k \leq 15$, resulting in a 30-dimensional dynamical system ($a_0(t) = 0$ for all t by the Galilean invariance [10]).

Excluding the trivial equilibrium $u(x,t) = 0$, the set of detected coherent structures for this system consists of three equilibria, two travelling waves, and over 60 000 relative periodic orbits and pre-periodic orbits with periods in the range between about 10 and 200 [10]. This will be the set P= $\{p_i\}$ from which we will select a subset of coherent structures for the minimal cover set W using (1) and (2).

A unique representation of the KS dynamics requires the use of symmetry reduced coordinates. Even though construction of a good symmetry-reduced representation for a given system is not straightforward [16], the use of the Hausdorff distance allows us to use any convenient invariant coordinates. In the current work, we will use the magnitudes of the complex Fourier modes, $|a_k|$. Even though in this representation we do not distinguish phase space points with the same Fourier mode magnitudes and different phases, the fact that we are looking at segments of orbits, rather than orbit points, allows us to faithfully distinguish any segments of orbits starting from different initial points in the full phase space. In fact, as we demonstrate below, we can take only a subset of $|a_k|$ with selected values of k and still make such a distinction.

In order to decide which k values to use, we determine the size of the chaotic attractor along each of the Fourier modes by measuring $m_k = \max_t |a_k(t)|$ along a long ergodic trajectory in the attractor, $t \in [0, 10^6]$. The values for the first seven Fourier modes are $m_{1,\ldots,7} = \{0.572, 0.981, 1.238, 0.579, 0.327, 0.224, 0.076\}$, with the values of m_k for $k > 7$ rapidly decreasing with increasing k. For the n-dimensional projection of the phase space we use n Fourier modes with the largest values of m_k. Thus, the 2-dimensional projection will include modes 2 and 3, the 3-dimensional projection will include modes 2, 3 and 4, and from then onwards for the n-dimensional projection the first n modes are used. We will denote W_n the minimal cover set constructed in the n-dimensional projection.

In what follows, in (3) we use the Euclidean norm in the n-dimensional projection, $\|\cdot\|_n$. The directed Hausdorff distance with associated n will be denoted $d_n(\cdot,\cdot)$. In the construction of the minimal cover, (1) and (2), the threshold parameter ε determines the *resolution* of the minimal cover. In the n-dimensional projection, we will use the value of ε_n equal to 1% of the length of the main diagonal of the hypercuboid with sides m_{k_j}, $j = 1,\ldots,n$ in the n-dimensional projection, where $k_j = \{3,2,4,1,5,6,7,\ldots\}$, that is, $\varepsilon_n = 0.01\sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^{n} m_{k_j}^2}$, resulting in the values $\varepsilon_{2,\ldots,7} = \{0.01579, 0.01682, 0.01776, 0.01807, 0.01820, 0.01822\}$ for the $2-7$-dimensional projections, and $\varepsilon_{15} = 0.01822$ in the full space of the numerical approximation of the KS solutions.



FIG. 1. (Color online) Shadowing of coherent structures p_{60} and p_7 by p_{137}. See text for details.

The application of the above outlined construction process to the set P in the n-dimensional symmetry-reduced projections resulted in the minimal cover sets W_n containing 67, 145, 361, 374, 387, and 394 coherent structures for $n = 2,\ldots,7$, respectively. We can see that the minimal cover set with 1% resolution contains only a small fraction of over 60 000 coherent structures in the available set P. This means that the vast majority of the coherent structures in P are approximated (or 'shadowed') within ε_n resolution by coherent structures within W_n. An example of such shadowing is shown in Fig. 1, where a relative periodic orbit p_{137} in W_4 with period 76.64 is shadowing two relative periodic orbits with periods 62.95 and 14.33 that are not in W_4. Note that the shorter orbits were removed from W_4 during stage (2), since p_{137} covers these orbits within ε_4, but also covers other parts of the attractor.

In order to ascertain how well each W_n covers the attractor in the full 15-dimensional space of all Fourier mode magnitudes, we calculated what percentage of coherent structures in the set $\mathrm{P}\backslash\mathrm{W}_n$ (i.e. those in P, but



FIG. 2. (Color online) Percentage of coherent structures in $\mathrm{P}\backslash\mathrm{W}_n$ that spend at least a fraction $m \leq 1$ of their period within ε_{15} distance of W_n, with $m = 1.0$, 0.99, 0.98, and 0.97 denoted by dots, crosses, squares, and diamonds, respectively.

not in W_n) spend at least a fraction $m \leq 1$ of their period within ε_{15} distance of W_n. In other words, what percentage of structures i in $\mathrm{P}\backslash\mathrm{W}_n$ satisfy: there exists $\tilde{p}_i \subset p_i \in \mathrm{P} \setminus \mathrm{W}_n$ such that $T^{\tilde{p}_i} \geq mT^{p_i}$ with $d_{15}(\tilde{p}_i, \mathrm{W}_n) \leq \varepsilon_{15}$. Fig. 2 shows that the percentage of such coherent structures is relatively small for $m = 1.0$, even for larger n, yet it increases to nearly 90% for $n \geq 4$ when m is decreased slightly to 0.98. At the same time, the percentage remains low for $n = 2$ and 3. Therefore, the smallest dimension of the projection that can be used to construct a reliable minimal cover is $n = 4$. We will use W_4 for further analysis of shadowing of a chaotic attractor by the minimal cover set of coherent structures.

Shadowing of chaotic attractor. With the help of thus constructed minimal cover set W_4, we can begin to put Poincaré's conjecture into practice by representing a chaotic trajectory as a sequence of segments shadowed by coherent structures in W_4. There are many possible ways to associate a segment of a chaotic trajectory with a particular coherent structure within W_4. For example, we can use the 'nearest' representation, where each point on the chaotic trajectory is associated with the nearest structure in W_4. However, because we are working with the lower dimensional projections of the dynamics, such representation may not always find the nearest structure in the full space. Another approach would be to find all coherent structures which are within ε_4 of a chaotic trajectory segment and associate the segment with one of such structures chosen at random. Such a 'random' representation would be more appropriate for systems with noise, for example when analysing experimental time series data.

In the present work, we adopt a 'greedy' representation, where from among all the coherent structure which are within ε_4 of a chaotic trajectory segment, we associate the segment with the structure which stays within ε_4 for the longest period of time. This approach is consistent with our earlier observation that segments of trajectories, which remain close to one another in a low-dimensional projection for some time, are likely to be close, or 'dynamically linked', in the full phase space.

More specifically, given a chaotic trajectory $\mathbf{a}(t), t \geq t_0$ with starting point $\mathbf{a}(t_0)$, find the structure $w_{s_0} \in \mathrm{W}_4$ that stays within ε_4 of the trajectory for the longest period of time, say until $t = t_1$. Then we associate the finite segment of trajectory $\phi_0 = \{\mathbf{a}(t), t \in [t_0, t_1)\}$ with the coherent structure w_{s_0}. Repeating this process from the point $\mathbf{a}(t_1)$, we associate the segment $\phi_1 = \{\mathbf{a}(t), t \in [t_1, t_2)\}$ with the coherent structure w_{s_1}. And so on. As a result, the chaotic trajectory is subdivided into finite time segments $\{\phi_0, \phi_1, \ldots\}$ labelled with indices $\{s_0, s_1, \ldots\}$ such that segment ϕ_i is shadowed by $w_{s_i} \in \mathrm{W}_4$.

In Fig. 3 we show an example of the encoding of a short trajectory $\mathbf{a}(t), t \in [0, 533]$ by W_4 using a 'greedy' shadowing algorithm. In the upper part of the figure, $\mathbf{a}(t)$ is depicted with the different segments marked by different line styles and colours; in the lower part of the figure is the distance between the orbit $\mathbf{a}(t)$ and the assigned structure in W_4. We see that, as expected, when $d_4(\mathbf{a}(t), w_{s_i}) = \varepsilon_4$ the algorithm finds the next structure in W_4 that stays within ε_4 for the longest period of time.



FIG. 3. (Color online) *Top*: Encoding of a short segment of a typical trajectory in the attractor by structures in W_4, shown in a two-dimensional projection. *Bottom*: Distance between trajectory and chosen structure in W_4 at time t. The chosen structures for each respective segment are $w_8, w_{237}, w_{242}, w_{70}$, and w_{319}; segment transitions are indicated by black dots and a change in line colour and style.

In summary, we have presented a general method for constructing a minimal cover of a high-dimensional attractor from the known coherent structures embedded in the attractor. We have given an example of such a construction for a Kuramoto-Sivashinsky chaotic attractor, and explored the effect that dimension of projection during construction has on the covering of the attractor. We show that a reliable minimal cover can be constructed in the low-dimensional projection of the attractor, thus substantially reducing the complexity and computational cost of such a construction compared to the full phase space representation. We have also demonstrated how any trajectory in the attractor can be encoded as a sequence of cover elements which shadow this trajectory. Such a representation opens the possibility of describing the dynamics on the attractor as a Markov-type model, which will be the subject of future research.

[1] G. D. Birkhoff, Acta Mathematica **50**, 359 (1927).

[2] P. Cvitanović, R. Artuso, R. Mainieri, G. Tanner, and G. Vattay, *Chaos: Classical and Quantum* (Niels Bohr Institute, Copenhagen, 2012) `ChaosBook.org`.

[3] I. Procaccia, Nature **333**, 498 (1988).

[4] Y. Lan and P. Cvitanović, Physical review E **78**, 026208 (2008).

[5] V. López, P. Boyland, M. T. Heath, and R. D. Moser, SIAM Journal on Applied Dynamical Systems **4**, 1042 (2005).

[6] B. Hof, C. W. van Doorne, J. Westerweel, F. T. Nieuwstadt, H. Faisst, B. Eckhardt, H. Wedin, R. R. Kerswell, and F. Waleffe, Science **305**, 1594 (2004).

[7] H. Faisst and B. Eckhardt, Physical Review Letters **91**, 224502 (2003).

[8] H. Wedin and R. Kerswell, Journal of Fluid Mechanics **508**, 333 (2004).

[9] S. M. Zoldi and H. S. Greenside, Physical Review E **57**, R2511 (1998).

[10] P. Cvitanović, R. L. Davidchack, and E. Siminos, SIAM Journal on Applied Dynamical Systems **9**, 1 (2010).

[11] I. G. Kevrekidis, B. Nicolaenko, and J. C. Scovel, SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics **50**, 760 (1990).

[12] F. Hausdorff, *Mengenlehre* (Walter de Gruyter Berlin, 1927).

[13] R. T. Rockafellar and R. J.-B. Wets, *Variational analysis*, Vol. 317 (Springer Science & Business Media, 2009).

[14] D. P. Huttenlocher, G. Klanderman, W. J. Rucklidge, *et al.*, Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence, IEEE Transactions on **15**, 850 (1993).

[15] F. Takens, in *Dynamical Systems and Turbulence, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 898*, edited by D. Rand and L.-S. Young (Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, NY, 1981) pp. 366–381.

[16] N. B. Budanur, P. Cvitanović, R. L. Davidchack, and E. Siminos, Phys. Rev. Lett. **114**, 084102 (2015).